South Mountain Corridor Study
Citizens Advisory Team Meeting
June 26, 2008
Parking Lot Issues

The following questions or issues were brought forward as part of the May 22, 2008, South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team (SMCAT) meeting and designated as parking lot issues because the study team needed to conduct research to address the question or issue accordingly. In addition, questions submitted on blue question cards by SMCAT members and the public are answered below. Each comment received on a blue question card is written in this document as submitted. Each parking lot issue is addressed by presenting the question asked, followed by the Arizona Department of Transportation's (ADOT) written response.

This document is divided into two sections. The first section lists those questions that have ADOT responses. The subsequent section contains the questions that will be addressed in a future parking lot issues memorandum.

Questions answered from May 22, 2008, SMCAT meeting

Topic	SMCAT member/public question	ADOT response
Hazardous Materials	Your map shows a mid-priority risk site at about Southern and 67th avenues. What site is this? That is located so close to the Salt River.	This site is the Western Meat Company, located at 7201 West Southern Avenue. The description in the Underground Storage Tank (UST) database includes two cases that were closed (Arizona Department of Environmental Quality [ADEQ] did not require further action) or not in use as of 1990 and 1992. The Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) database includes two cases closed (ADEQ did not require further action) as of 1997. The Western Meat Company is located within the W71 Alternative and would not be impacted by the W55 Alternative.
	On slide 25 of the PowerPoint presentation, identification of hazardous materials sites may adversely affect planned development unrelated to the proposed South Mountain Freeway. What are these?	Planned development includes any property development that involves transfer of ownership, excavation of hazardous material-impacted soil or withdrawal of potentially-impacted groundwater. This development may or may not be related to transportation infrastructure projects.
	Can the list of sites for identified sites be available to the SMCAT members?	SMCAT members can review the list of identified hazardous materials sites in the South Mountain Freeway Study Area by scheduling an appointment with ADOT representatives Mike Bruder at 602.712.6836 or Mark Hollowell at 602.712.6819.

Hazardous Materials (continued)	Slide 28 of the PowerPoint presentation references "developing, implementing and maintaining" a list of hazardous material routes. What are these routes today? What are the hazardous materials being transported?	ADOT is in the process of developing a statewide Hazardous Materials Routing Plan. There are three locations that have been identified in the state (all within the Valley) where hazardous materials shipments are restricted. These locations are the I-10 Deck Park tunnel, ramp from US 60 eastbound to State Route 101 southbound, and State Route 202 between McClintock Drive and Dobson Road [Salt River Bridge span]). Hazardous materials transported on Arizona highways include all and any allowed by U.S. Department of Transportation regulations.
Geotechnical	On slide 35 of the PowerPoint, a geotechnical investigation of the cut areas was completed with the original freeway documents in 1987. Was this updated to the current time? If so, can this be made available to the SMCAT members?	The 1987 geotechnical investigation of the cut areas in the South Mountains was confined to three major rock cut areas within a 2.5-mile long segment of the South Mountain Freeway alignment, as proposed in 1987. The 1987 investigation report has not been updated to the present; however, the information is usable and valid for analysis of the currently proposed alignment. Similar to the technical reports, SMCAT members can review a copy of the 1987 geotechnical investigation report by scheduling an appointment with ADOT representatives Mike Bruder at 602.712.6836 or Mark Hollowell at 602.712.6819.
	Is there a blasting plan that can be released to the SMCAT members?	Preparation of site- and blast-area specific blasting plans for rock cut areas in the South Mountains would be the responsibility of the contractor (and subject to ADOT review and approval) during construction. Therefore at this time, no blasting plans are available.
	On slide 38 of the PowerPoint presentation, "the rock slopes for the E1 Alternative would be designed using industry-accepted guidelines: therefore no impacts are expected." Has a technical report been issued, and if so, can it be made available to the SMCAT members?	The technical reports addressing rock cut slope designs would be prepared as part of the preliminary and final geotechnical investigations of the selected freeway alignment. The 1987 geotechnical investigation report contains limited, preliminary information regarding rock cut slope design. The technical report that was prepared as a part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process is available for SMCAT members to review. Please contact ADOT representatives Mike Bruder at 602.712.6836 or Mark Hollowell at 602.712.6819 to schedule an appointment.
Cost Estimate	Has the project team looked at the possibility of updating the cost estimate? What is the date of that cost estimate? If and when could this cost estimate be updated?	The project cost estimates were reviewed and updated in November 2007. The study team generally reviews and updates the cost estimates annually. It is anticipated the study team will review and update the cost estimates prior to the September 25, 2008, SMCAT meeting.

Miscellaneous	The whole purpose of the blasting conversation is focused on construction. What about the environmental impacts? What are the far-reaching aspects and would there be any significance? If you create openings in the granite by blasting, then the rock integrity begins to change. This could include the water that flows off the mountain. I find this disconcerting that you are not looking at the entire Study Area, but rather, only the alignment.	The question relates to secondary and cumulative impact potential resulting from construction activities directly associated with the project. Secondary impacts are those caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but still reasonably foreseeable. Cumulative impacts are those resulting from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency undertakes such other actions. For topography, geology and soils–the category within which blasting-related issues would be considered–results of preliminary geological assessments and studies and prior construction experience with comparable projects indicate that secondary and cumulative impacts (from construction blasting and excavation activities to the integrity of the remaining in-place rock) would be negligible.
	Letting us know the implementation plan for what happens outside of the right-of-way should be in the parking lot issue memorandum. I do not consider this a complete study if you only report what you are looking for. That is like saying that if someone has a heart attack, you have determined that the problem must have been with the heart. The problem may have been caused elsewhere. With this project, we could have issues in other areas of the Study Area and not just the corridor. It could be a function of the entire mountain.	The scope of an EIS evolves during the development process. Generally, the scope of study begins with an assessment by a multidisciplinary team of what important social, environmental, operational and design factors should be analyzed. This often starts with what is known about a given area. Later, the scope is refined through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)-required scoping phase of the EIS process. While this phase officially occurs early, it continues throughout the remainder of the process. In this phase, the study team actively seeks input from appropriate agencies and the public regarding environmental conditions, project concerns and alternatives; it is most effective when the comments provided are specific in nature. Often times, comments received relate directly to off-site conditions that may be affected by or have a direct affect on the project proposed. The team then takes all of these comments into account in determining the level of analysis required for the study with direct consideration of what are widely-accepted methodologies by scientific and planning communities and what is specifically required as a part of NEPA and the decision making process.

Questions to be addressed in a future parking lot issues memorandum

Topic	**SMCAT member/public question**
Energy	I would like to see some of the underlying figures that you used to compute your energy numbers. I don't see that much fuel being used in the Study Area.
	On slide 51 of the PowerPoint, you mentioned that there was an anticipated vehicle mix. Do you have specific numbers for each of these categories?
	When you provide us with the vehicle mix percentages, can you provide a breakdown of each of the elements: cars, light and heavy trucks, etcetera?